

REMARKS

Claims 21, 26 and 33 are amended and Claims 30 and 38 are cancelled. Claims 21-29 and 31-37 remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated February 22, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 21-29 and 31-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo in view of May (3,747,275).

The Examiner objected to Claims 30 and 38 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants' Response:

Claims 21 and 26 have been rewritten to include the subject matter of cancelled Claim 30. Claim 33 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of cancelled Claim 38. In view of the Examiner's statement that Claims 30 and 38 would be allowable, Applicants believe that amended Claims 21, 26 and 33 define patentable subject matter.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record shows the known use of inflatable seals to seal doors of all types and applications. The Examiner cited: Covey, III (4,441,278); Anderson et al. (3,352,446); Pot (4,114,901); Coverley (3,100,918); McDonald et al. (3,694,962); McCormack (4,177,353); Zand (2,104,144); Finley (2,530,160); James (4,706,413); and EP 0 665 183 A2. Applicants reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in his rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.